

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated March 15, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 8-11, 22-25, 33-36, 45-48 and 55-58.

By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1, 7, 9, 13, 21, 23, 28, 30, 34, 40, 42, 46, 50, 54 and 56 are amended. In addition, claims 8, 22, 33, 45 and 55 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-7, 9-21, 23-32, 34-44, 46-54 and 56-59 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to and claims 30-36, 42-28 and 54-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In addition, claims 7-12, 21-27, 30-36, 42-48 and 54-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In particular, in the "Response to Arguments" section of the Office Action, the Examiner asks for clarification on the difference between the insulating 58 and the insulating layer 69, and asserts that the drawings do not show a first transparent layer on the color filter.

First of all, "insulating layer 58" at paragraph [0155] was replaced with the "insulating layer 69" in the previous response. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that reference number 58 is no longer shown in the specification. Second, Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to drawings are now believed to be moot in view of the amendments in paragraphs [0051], [0062] and [0073]. Third, Applicants respectfully submit that the features recited in claims 30, 42 and 54, which are currently amended, are illustrated in Figs. 13, 19 and 20, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

On page 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 13-20, 28, 29, 40, 41 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,847,690) in view of Yoshioka (U.S. Patent No. 5,162,782). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...wherein each of the first and second coil arrays include a plurality of coils, and each of the plurality of coils has first and second open ends..." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 2-6, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 13 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 13 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...wherein each of the first and second coil arrays include a plurality of coils, and each of the plurality of coils has first and second open ends..." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 and claims 14-20, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 28 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 28 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...wherein each of the first and second coil arrays include a plurality of coils, and each of the plurality of coils has first and second open ends..." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 28 and claim 29, which depends therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 40 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 40 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...wherein each of the first and second coil arrays include a plurality of coils, and each of the plurality of coils has first and second open ends..." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 40 and claims 41 and 49, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 50 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 50 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...wherein each of the first and second coil arrays include a plurality of coils, and each of the plurality of coils has first and second open ends..." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 50 and claims 51-54 and 59, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

On page 14 of the Office Action, claims 37, 49 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boie et al. in view of Yoshioka and Toyoshima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,235). Because Toyoshima et al. fails to cure the deficient teachings of Boie et al. and Yoshioka as discussed above, claims 37, 49 and 59 are allowable over the cited references.

On page 15 of the Office Action, claims 38 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boie et al. in view of Yoshioka and Kiguchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,630,274). Because Kiguchi et al. fails to cure the deficient teachings of Boie et al. and Yoshioka as discussed above, claims 38 and 52 are allowable over the cited references.


On page 15 of the Office Action, claims 39 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boie et al. in view of Yoshioka and Ahn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,284,436). Because Ahn et al. fails to cure the deficient teachings of Boie et al. and Yoshioka as discussed above, claims 39 and 53 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: **15 May 2007**

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Eric J. Nuss  
Registration No.: **40,106**  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant